

MR3529-9

Serial Number: 10/820,365

Response to Office Action Dated 5 May 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 5 May 2006. Responsive to that Office Action, Claims 1, 4 – 6, 8 – 10, 12, 14 – 16, 20 – 25, and 29 – 30 have been amended for further prosecution with the other pending claims. It is believed that with such amendment of claims, there is a further clarification of their recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 1, 5 – 6, 8, 10, 14 – 16, 20 – 21, 23 – 25, and 29 – 30 for containing certain specifically noted informalities. Each of these specifically noted points of objection have been corrected as directed by the Examiner. In addition, certain other typographic informalities incidentally noted by the undersigned attorney were also corrected. It is believed that the corrections to the claims incorporated hereby now obviate the Examiner's formal concerns in this regard.

The Examiner also objected to Claims 8 – 9 and 23 – 24 for certain potentially confusing wording. It is believed that the amendments incorporated into these claims also obviate such formal concern.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 7, 10 – 22, and 25 – 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Lampaert et al. reference. As for Claims 8 – 9 and 23 – 24, the Examiner indicated that these Claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the

MR3529-9

Serial Number: 10/820,365

Response to Office Action Dated 5 May 2006

limitations of the base and any intervening claims, and to overcome the formal objections thereto.

Accordingly, each of the Claims 8 – 9 and 23 – 24 has been amended to independent form, incorporating therein the subject matter of its base claim, as well as certain corrections to the wording to address the Examiner's formal objection. It is believed therefore that Claims 8 – 9 and 23 – 24 are now in allowable form.

Each of the remaining independent Claims 1 and 16 is also now amended to more clearly recite their recitations. These Claims each now more clearly recite among their combination of features the processing of recognition layer data to generate parameter data which describes a shape of the given spiral. This shape is "divided into a plurality of polygonal segments for separate processing relating thereto."

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by each of the newly-amended independent Claims 1 and 16 is nowhere disclosed by the cited Lampaert et al. reference. While Lampaert et al. does set forth the general recognition in the art of a layout versus circuit schematic (LVS) verification process to identify space and width violations in a given layout, such is the extent of its relevant disclosures. The focus of the reference is a certain approach to predictively generating the layout, not to any particular means by which the LVS process is to occur. Consequently, the reference nowhere either

MR3529-9

Serial Number: 10/820,365

Response to Office Action Dated 5 May 2006

discloses or suggests a verification method wherein recognition layer data is processed in such manner that the spiral shape of the given conductive material is "divided into a plurality of polygonal segments," as Claims 1 and 16 now clarify, much less "for separate processing relating thereto," as those claims also now clarify.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the Lampaert et al. reference, even when considered in combination with any other cited reference, fails to disclose the full combination of elements now more clearly recited by Applicants' pending claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application. The other references cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection are believed to be further remote from Applicants' claimed method and computer-readable media when patentability considerations are taken properly into account.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

MR3529-9

Serial Number: 10/820,365

Response to Office Action Dated 5 May 2006

If there are any further fees necessary in this filing, the Director of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 18-2011 for such additional charges

Respectfully submitted,
FOR ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee

Registration #40,262


Dated: 9/5/2006

3458 Ellicott Center Drive, Suite 101
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Art Unit #2825, facsimile number 571-273-8300 on the date shown below.

9/5/2006
Date


Jun Y. Lee